

**FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE/TRANSPORTATION
ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2005**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

John R. Byers, Mount Vernon District
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Ronald W. Koch, Sully District
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District
Laurie Frost-Wilson, Commissioner At-Large

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Nancy Hopkins, Dranesville District

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

George Barker, Chairman, At-Large
Earl Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
Janyce Hedetniemi, Vice Chairman, Braddock District

STAFF PRESENT:

Barbara J. Lippa, Executive Director, Planning Commission Office
Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk, Planning Commission Office
Leonard Wolfenstein, Acting Chief, Planning Division, Fairfax County Department of
Transportation (FCDOT)
Jaak Pedak, FCDOT
Jay Guy, Transportation Planner, FCDOT

//

Chairman Frank de la Fe convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Conference Room, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Chairman de la Fe noted that the first item on the agenda tonight was approval of minutes for the June 2, 2005 the June 28, 2005 Committee meetings.

Commissioner Byers SO MOVED. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously with Commissioner Hopkins absent from the meeting.

//

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE/TRANSPORTATION
ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING

October 26, 2005

Chairman de la Fe stated that the next agenda item was an update on the status of proposed revisions to the Transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan

//

Leonard Wolfenstein, Acting Chief, Planning Division, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT), explained that a second round of public meetings would be held November 1-10, 2005, at seven locations around the County on the proposed policies and the latest travel demand forecasting results. He said the Planning Commission's public hearing on these changes should take place in early 2006.

Mr. Wolfenstein said activities which had taken place to date were: a public announcement in December 2004 that an update of the Transportation Plan would begin in 2005; development of a website; public comment period held through May 31, 2005; seven meetings held around the County in March 2005; two workshops held at the Government Center on travel demand forecasting; meetings with the Transportation Advisory Commission (TAC), the Planning Commission's Transportation Committee, and other groups including the Trails Committee, Council on Aging, and the Environmental Quality Advisory Council.

Mr. Wolfenstein explained that the review of the transportation element had required more effort than anticipated and had been a collaborative effort with TAC. He said the proposal before the committee tonight would be presented at the public meetings in November. He reviewed the proposed changes to the Plan, noting that wordiness had been reduced; jargon and redundancy eliminated; a transportation demand objective added; and airport and new challenges objectives deleted. He said a number of policies had been subsumed into existing objectives. He noted that a policy addressing "context sensitive solutions" identified in the Board of Supervisors' four year transportation plan as "context engineering" had been added. Mr. Wolfenstein also pointed out that changes to the appendices concerning types of transit services and facilities and trails were being recommended.

In response to a question from Chairman de la Fe, Mr. Wolfenstein said that the trails plan appendix replicated what was already in the Trails Plan to make the information more accessible.

George Barker, Chairman, At-Large, TAC, said TAC would review the proposed update in detail at its meeting next Tuesday, November 1, 2005.

Janyce Hedetniemi, Vice Chairman, Braddock District, TAC, said TAC was pleased with how staff had responded to their concerns about redundancies, verbiage, and jargon so that the document would be something citizens could understand. She said staff had taken TAC's concerns seriously and thoughtfully and the few remaining concerns were fixable.

Commissioner Byers commented that he had been under the impression that Area Plans Review (APR) nominations on transportation needs had not been accepted during the current cycle

because they were going to be addressed in the revision to the Transportation Policy Plan. However, he said they were not.

Mr. Wolfenstein responded the intent had never been to address transportation issues in each Area Plan and that the Planning Commission, the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), and the Fairfax County Department of Transportation needed to discuss how they would be handled. Mr. Wolfenstein added that APR nominations pertaining to neighborhood transportation planning had been rejected by the Planning Commission staff. Chairman de la Fe commented that it had been decided prior to the North County APR process that general plans, such as Parks and Transportation, would not be dealt with during the current APR cycle. Commissioner Byers commented that the road improvements he was referring to were specific, not general.

Commissioner Hart said his recollection was that although citizen nominations for specific parks or transportation changes were not going to be permitted during the APR cycle, there would be a Countywide process to consider suggestions made by both staff and citizens. He further recalled specific discussions about receiving suggestions from citizens, on both text and the transportation map, which would be reviewed by staff and authorized broadly enough so that they could be considered via a public hearing process. Chairman de la Fe concurred with Commissioner Hart's recollections.

Mr. Wolfenstein commented that he thought Commissioners Byers and Hart were talking about two different things. He said the Countywide Transportation Plan would deal with policies and the transportation plan map, but some local roads and access issues would be dealt with in Area Plans text under transportation that were not within the purview of a Countywide policy review. He said this was a legitimate issue which should be addressed by the Planning Commission and DPZ.

Chairman de la Fe said although transportation recommendations would not be accepted during the current APR cycle, citizens had been told during the North County APR cycle that they could submit suggestions for transportation improvements and asked why the same couldn't be done for South County. Commissioner Byers responded because the changes he was referring to were not policy changes.

Chairman de la Fe asked if rejected transportation nominations could be forwarded to FCDOT as input to the transportation plan map. Commissioner Byers commented that changing the map but not the text would not be a good idea and pointed out that text takes precedence over the map. Mr. Barker noted that this issue had been discussed before and said the Countywide transportation map dealt with arterial roadways only and many of the issues raised during the current APR cycle concerned collector and local roads. He said it should be clear when transportation recommendations would be considered and a process established to do so.

Responding to Commissioner Byers' suggestion that a special process be established next year to consider transportation changes for the entire County, Mr. Wolfenstein said he thought

transportation changes should be addressed during the regular APR process rather than a whole new process established.

Earl Flanagan, Mount Vernon District, TAC, said there was a possibility that Mount Vernon Supervisor Gerry Hyland would handle these recommendations through an Out-of-Turn Plan Amendment.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Hart, Mr. Wolfenstein said no nominations relating to Area Plan text similar to the Mount Vernon nominations had been received from other districts. He added that some suggestions related to collector-type streets had been received but they were already on the Countywide Plan map. He said suggestions received not relevant to this review had been directed to the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) or another section of FCDOT.

Chairman de la Fe commented that recommendations for roads not shown on the Plan map had been precluded from consideration during the current APR process and that a decision needed to be made about how to handle them. He added that if the text was changed, the map needed to be changed at the same time.

Commissioner Lawrence agreed a better process was needed. He also commented that he was pleased to see Transportation Demand Management raised to the level of a policy objective and said he hoped it would become an automatic part of the land use process.

Chairman de la Fe requested that a list of transportation related suggestions received for both North and South County be provided to the Committee and TAC so it could be determined which ones would affect the map being considered as part of the Policy Plan review and how they could best be handled.

Responding to a question from Chairman de la Fe about issues raised on arterial roadways and freeways, Mr. Wolfenstein said a consultant was modeling several scenarios from which a hybrid network would be developed.

Commissioner Wilson pointed out that a Planning Commission public hearing on an amendment to the Public Facilities Manual concerning subdivision streets was scheduled for tomorrow night and included widening of right-of-way in certain circumstances. She asked if this issue had been addressed in the draft Policy Plan. Mr. Wolfenstein responded that the Policy Plan did not deal with subdivision streets. Commissioner Wilson said it could in certain circumstances.

Commissioner Hart pointed out that Objective 4, Policy d. of the Proposed Transportation Policy Plan dated October 2005 stated "Provide sidewalks on both sides of streets." (A copy of the Proposed Transportation Policy Plan is in the date file.) Mr. Wolfenstein said the previous policy required sidewalks on both sides of streets in commercial areas and in an effort to broaden this policy, "commercial areas" had been deleted.

//

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE/TRANSPORTATION
ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING

October 26, 2005

Responding to a question from Chairman de la Fe on another issue, Mr. Wolfenstein said both the Bull Run battlefield bypass and the alignment of the tri-county parkway were on the Commonwealth Transportation Board's agenda at their November meeting, but that he did not know whether or not they would take action on them at that time. In response to another question from Chairman de la Fe, Mr. Wolfenstein said a study was being conducted on the battlefield bypass by the Federal Highway Administration on behalf of the National Park Service. Mr. Barker noted that although there was a federal interest in having traffic routed around the bypass, there was no authorization or funding for it. Chairman de la Fe pointed out that the alignment of the tri-county parkway was in the Comprehensive Plan, but the battlefield bypass was not. Mr. Wolfenstein commented that there was a possibility that the battlefield bypass could be put in the Plan after the public hearing process had been completed.

//

Chairman de la Fe said he would like another committee meeting scheduled in January to continue discussion on issues raised tonight.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.
Frank A. de la Fe, Chairman

For a verbatim record of this meeting, reference may be made to the audio recording which can be found in the Fairfax County, Virginia Planning Commission Office.

Minutes by: Linda B. Rodeffer

Approved on: January 26, 2006

Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk
Fairfax County Planning Commission